



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

CW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,673	04/16/2001	Wolfgang Buchalla	ARE0005	8209

832 7590 07/23/2003

BAKER & DANIELS
111 E. WAYNE STREET
SUITE 800
FORT WAYNE, IN 46802

EXAMINER

WILSON, JOHN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3732	

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/835,673	BUCHALLA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John J. Wilson	3732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 15-30 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, line 8, "drill head" lacks proper antecedent basis within the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 8, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bianchetti (6095810). Bianchetti shows a housing 1, drill head 14, motor 2 and light source 11 that has a desired wavelength of 450-470 nm, column 2, lines 9-12, excavation means 10 and illumination guide means 15. The shown structure is inherently capable of functioning to produce tooth luminescence. All of the structure being shown, to use for excavating carious material is merely intended use that the shown structure is capable of performing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meller (4642738) in view of Bianchetti (6095810). Meller shows a housing having a drill bit 32 and light source 40 for directing light in a direction along which the drill bit protrudes. Meller does not show using light having a wavelength operable to produce tooth luminescence. Bianchetti teaches supplying light to a tool at a desired wavelength of 450-470 nm, column 2, lines 9-12. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Meller to include using light at this range in order to better see the desired characteristic. As to claim 2, Meller does not show the use of fiber optics to connect the light source to an opening. Bianchetti teaches using an illumination guide 15. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Meller to include a fiber optic connector as shown by Bianchetti in order to guide light to the desired location. As to claims 4 and 5, the specific wavelength used is an obvious matter of choice in the degree of a known parameter used to the skilled artisan. As to claim 6 and 10, to use the bulb to filter light that is emitted is well known in the art of making bulbs. As to claim 7 and 11, Meller does not show a semiconductor device. Bianchetti teaches using a semiconductor device LED 11. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

modify Meller to include the use of a semiconductor device as shown by Bianchetti in order to make use of known ways of delivering light to a desired work area.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meller (4642738) in view of Bianchetti (6095810) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Schuss (4498868). The above combination does not show the use of a glass rod. Schuss teaches using a glass rod 45, Fig. 7, to provide light in a dental handpiece. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above combination to include the use of a glass rod as shown by Schuss in order to make use of art known ways to provide light in dental handpieces.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bianchetti (6095810) in view of Meller (4642738). Bianchetti shows the structure as described in the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection above, however, does not show a bulb. Meller shows using a bulb 40 to provide light in a dental handpiece. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Bianchetti to include the use of a bulb as shown by Meller in order to make use of art known ways to provide light in dental handpieces. Using the bulb to filter light that is emitted is well known in the art of making bulbs.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bianchetti (6095810). Bianchetti shows the structure as described in the 35 U.S.C.

102(b) rejection above, however, does not show the specific wavelength, however, does show a range 450-470. The specific wavelength used is an obvious matter of choice in the degree of a known parameter to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meller (4642738) in view of Lafond (EP 0113152). Meller shows a housing 20, drill head as shown and light source 40 through an opening in the housing as shown. Meller does not show a filter for producing tooth fluorescence. Lafond shows a filter 60. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Meller to include a filter as shown by Lafond because the claimed elements are merely separate elements listed together, and as such, a listing of prior art showing the separate elements is proper and obvious. As to claim 14, the specific filtered wavelength is an obvious matter of choice in the degree of a known parameter to the skilled artisan.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15-30 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 13, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to the newly claimed drill bit, see new rejection above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to John Wilson at telephone number (703) 308-2699.



John J. Wilson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3732

jjw
July 18, 2003
Fax (703) 308-2708
Work Schedule: Monday through Friday, Flex Time